

Temperance-1925 A NEW COLOR LINE

WE HAVE IT now on good authority from the Bourbon South that there is co-operation as well as a color line in the illegal manufacture, possession and sale of intoxicating liquor. In defending a Negro client charged with moonshining, a white southern lawyer told the jury that the making of liquor was a white man's game. Of course he may have been indulging in oratorical license but the fact remains that court records show the majority of those charged with manufacturing are whites, while those charged with sale are Negroes. At any rate this condition is evidently prevalent in the South.

We pause long enough to inquire why it is that a portion of the effort given in this new lineup could not well be used in holding the law. It is a poor rule that doesn't work both ways. If a color line can be used to break laws, surely it could be used to enforce laws.

Let's see how it would work on the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments

New York, June 24.—(P)—William George M. House, after a hearing yesterday.

H. Anderson, former superintendent of the New York Anti-Saloon league, and now at liberty on parole from Sing Sing prison under conviction of third degree forgery, announced today the formation of a new organization to carry on "a national Protestant movement." It is to be known as the American Prohibition Protestant Patriotic Protective alliance.



W. H. ANDERSON.

"It will be a league, offensive and defensive," Mr. Anderson explained, "to resist abject surrender in the name of a bogus tolerance of everything vital to true religion and a genuine patriotism."

Disclaiming any intention to oppose or to injure the Anti-Saloon league, the founder of the alliance declared it was purposed to utilize that organization "for certain useful work," but to avoid its weakness.

An arrangement was announced whereby the alliance will "find expression" through the columns of the Fellowship Forum, a periodical published in Washington, D. C.

BRADDOCK PAVEMENT
MARCH 13, 1925

Dope Peddler Is Held For Court

Hollie Kelly, one-armed Negro, who was arrested here several days ago with 32 capsules of cocaine in his possession, was held for court under \$1,000 bail by Justice of the Peace

Effect of Dry Law on Youth Of Nation Food for Thought, Church Council Report Shows

Survey Regrets That Prohibition "Had Had Little Buoyant Effect Upon Morals."

Washington, September 15.—(P)—An exhaustive discussion of the effect of prohibition on crime, conditions in settlement neighborhoods, drug addiction, the morals of the young, and respect for law in general, was made public tonight by the research and education department of the federal council of churches as a third section of its special report on the social consequences of prohibition laws.

While pointing out that a lack of complete data makes definite conclusions impossible, the report made these assertions:

The tendency of young people of the present day to depart from conventional rules of behavior cannot be laid entirely at the door of prohibition but "the fact that prohibition has made no more decisive effect in heightening their moral tone gives food for earnest thought."

Crime statistics indicate a rapid increase in violations of law, chiefly of the misdemeanor class, but it is "gratuitous" to blame prohibition, and "all that can be asserted is that prohibition has thus far not prevented an increase in such offenses."

Available information indicates that in settlement neighborhoods there is less drinking and family life has improved under prohibition but that the law nevertheless is widely violated and "the bootlegger is getting rich."

Assertions that prohibition has tended to increase the use of drugs lack definite proof and would appear to be untrue.

Facts Are Few.

"The general impression that respect for law is declining leads many ardent supporters of prohibition to believe that its foes are undermining all citizenship, while the latter assert very positively that prohibition has destroyed respect for all law. Fortunately, neither contention is fully supported by facts. The best authorities in psychology and education agree that a person's attitude toward law and government is not determined with reference to a single statute, and that hostility toward one law does not carry over into the whole field of the citizen's responsibility. The attitude

of people toward their government, although it often gives cause for concern, rests upon a broader basis than the popularity of a single law. Every one takes some laws more seriously than others, and necessarily so. All laws have not the same importance and some have greater social sanction than others. For this reason it would seem to be a mistake to rest the appeal for observance of prohibition

laws merely upon the general duty to 'obey the law.' Rather, an attitude of intelligent sympathy toward the law itself must be built up if it is to be generally observed.

"Reports of school administration officials and of teachers who have made extensive studies of moral problems in the schools give little support to the theory that prohibition is in itself a cause of moral breakdown," it continued. "It may perhaps just as truly be said that it does not appear to be a great asset. Certainly, the non-observance of the law by parents has a rather tragic effect on boys and girls."

"In the colleges, undoubtedly, some alarming conditions have developed. Even in a conservative denominational college a student has been known to earn his way through school by bootlegging. The evidence, however, seems to indicate a favorable trend at the present time; at least this is the opinion of nearly all the college deans consulted, and it receives some measure of support from other sources."

Crime Statistics.

We come now to crime statistics, which are commonly, and mistakenly, first appealed to in order to prove the benefits of prohibition. Crime statistics are notoriously inaccurate for a variety of reasons. Furthermore, the handling of this kind of data in prohibition publicity has been unfortunate. The best source for such data seems to be, not police records, but prison population reports. The chart shows the trend in prison population in state prisons throughout the country.

As will be noted, the index numbers representing the proportion of state prisoners to total population of the United States (1917 equals 100) fell to 78 in 1920 but rose to 97 in 1923.

While an inspection of this chart suggests that prohibition has only temporarily, if at all, lessened prison offenses, it must be remembered that the post-war period would be expected to be marked by an increase in crime, and it is quite possible that the effect of prohibition is really shown in the retardation of the post-war crime reaction. In any case the low level reached in 1920, considered in the light of other data presented, seems to indicate the effect of prohibition, when first enacted, upon violations of the law. Further, the subsequent rise, by comparison with the other indices that we have examined, likewise suggests that we are dealing

here with forces in which liquor is a definite factor.

A by-product of the present investigation has been a study of the relation between prison population and the business barometer, the results of which tend to show a low negative correlation. That is to say, when business prosperity increases, offenses tend slightly to decrease, while business depression tends correspondingly to increase their number. The basis of this study was the prison record of Massachusetts as compared with the American Telephone and Telegraph company's index of general business activity for the entire country over a period of forty-five years. The result agrees generally with that reached by other studies in the same field. Thus, in our curve of prison population we had one or more influences at work which reversed the tendency of the business cycle—that is, which reduced offenses at a time when they might be expected to rise. Presumably one such influence was prohibition. The conformity to our other curves is impressive. But if this is true, the subsequent increase must be at least partially attributed to a lessening of the initial effect of prohibition.

Study of Arrests.

A study of arrests (both total, and on charge of intoxication) over a period of eight years has recently been made by the World League Against Alcoholism. The preliminary report of the study shows, on the face of the figures, a considerable increase in the crime rate as compared with pre-prohibition years. The following table shows the result in index numbers:

Index Nos. of Arrests for all Offenses and Arrests for Intoxication per 1,000 Population in 185 Cities in the United States, 1913-1923

	All Offenses	Intoxication
1913	104.61	119.50
1914	103.05	117.50
1915	105.81	111.00
1916	103.71	120.50
1917	109.74	114.50
1918	105.81	114.00
1919	91.11	60.50
1920	84.61	43.50
1921	94.87	53.50
1922	106.52	76.50
1923	118.46	87.00
1924x	(Not computed)	67.00

x125 cities.

The investigator who gathered the data, and who has very extensive experience in this type of work, is convinced that an analysis of the figures will show, as appears to be the case in New York city, that the general increase, which is astonishingly large, is due entirely to misdemeanors and chiefly to offenses against the traffic laws, and that serious crimes have not shown an increase. It is true that the records give no support for the assumption that felonies have increased generally, but it would appear from this table that up to 1923 drunkenness accounts for a large part of the increases in the total number of offenses. If, with increasing returns, the low index for drunkenness in 1924 still stands, which seems doubtful, the index for all offenses is likely to show a great reduction also.

Gotham Not Typical.

New York city cannot be taken as typical in this matter for a reason that will doubtless be surprising to

many people. The record of arrests in New York city, in so far as it may be taken as authoritative and reliable, is much more creditable than those of many other cities which enjoy a higher reputation for conventional conduct. The increase in total arrests since 1920 has not been great and cases of drunkenness are very much fewer in proportion to the population than in other cities; all of which gives a picture that is not at all typical. In Pittsburgh, for example, where the arrests for drunkenness are nearly twice as numerous, in absolute numbers, as in New York, they account, together with disorderly conduct and kindred offenses, for the larger part of the very great increase in total arrests since 1920—from 36,572 to 61,473.

The figures for Chicago for the last five years are worth noting in more detail:

Arrests in Chicago.

Total charges for felony: 1924, 16,516; 1923, 14,388; 1922, 15,919; 1921, 16,912; 1920, 15,273.

Total charges for misdemeanor: 1924, 239,829; 1923, 177,890; 1922, 127,266; 1921, 168,931; 1920, 79,810.

Here again, the record of felonies gives no support to a crime wave theory. Yet the enormous and continuous increase in misdemeanors is most disquieting. The chief items in this increase are the following:

Disorderly conduct, 1924, 87,370; 1923, 77,047; 1922, 66,033; 1921, 50,556; 1920, 32,852.

Disorderly house, house of ill-fame, keepers, inmates: 1924, 19,417; 1923, 12,029; 1922, 5,932; 1921, 5,878; 1920, 4,079.

Sundry licenses: 1924, 12,853; 1923, 235; 1922, 5,932; 1921, 5,878; 1920, 4,079.

Speed law violation: 1924, 35,536; 1923, 8,781; 1922, 2,772; 1921, 3,659; 1920, 3,086.

Parking ordinance: 1924, 20,474; 1923, 17,081; 1922, 7,932; 1921, 7,918; 1920, 2,269.

Search and seizure law: 1924, 8,323; 1923, 6,721; 1922, 2,559; 1921, 1,133; 1920, 449.

Minor Offenses.

Thus it appears that while the rapid increase in misdemeanors consists in large part of minor offenses incident to the growth of the city and to the increase in motor traffic, it is also due in very considerable measure to offenses which are associated with low moral tone and decreasing respect for law.

In Philadelphia, it appears that drunk and disorderly cases account for the very considerable increase in total arrests since 1920.

Figures for the District of Columbia show a substantial, though not large, increase in felonies over the past five years, and a very considerable increase in misdemeanors—the latter due chiefly to traffic law violations, drunkenness in public places and violations of the national prohibition act.

The surprising feature of the Boston figures is the fact that prohibition seems on the whole to have had no appreciable effect even in 1920 on offenses other than drunkenness, while with respect to the latter, which have nearly doubled since 1920, the city seems to be little better off than in 1919, although the showing is much better than in the years prior to 1919. The figures for the entire state of Massachusetts show substantially the same conditions.

The implications of these figures are the same as those of the World league's figures, namely, that there is unmistakably a rapid increase in violations of the law, chiefly of the misdemeanor class. It is gratuitous, however, to blame prohibition for this

fact. All that can be asserted is prohibition has thus far not prevented an increase in such offenses.

Caution Necessary.

The greatest caution should be used in drawing conclusions from crude statistics of crimes, since a growing proportion of them represent minor offenses that signify little save the increasing difficulty of keeping the procession of humanity moving and keeping individuals out of each other's way. Experts are not ready to say whether serious offenses are actually increasing or decreasing in the country at large. The opinion of the special committee on law enforcement of the American Bar association, contained in its report for 1922 and reaffirmed in 1923, is worth noting in this connection: "From all the data and opinions of experts which your committee has been able to gather, we beg leave to report that particularly since 1890, there has been and continues a widening, deepening tide of lawlessness in this country, sometimes momentarily receding, but swelling again into greater depths of intensity; at intervals this tide billows into waves that rise and break, but only for a time attracting attention. . . . The criminal situation in the United States so far as crimes of violence are concerned is worse than in any other civilized country. . . .

"While your committee cannot obtain the exact figures, from all available sources of information, we estimate that there were more than 9,500 unlawful homicides last year (1921) in this country; that in 1920 there occurred not less than 9,000 such homicides; and that in no year during the past 10 years did the number fall below 8,500. In other words, during the past 10 years no less than 85,000 of our citizens have perished by poison, by the pistol, or the knife, or by other unlawful and deadly injury."

Whatever the precise facts are, we seem to be dealing with forces that have long been operative and are fairly independent of liquor laws. But it is obvious that to rest the case for prohibition on the crime data and our present knowledge of them would be to choose an insecure foundation.

Settlement Neighborhoods.

The secretary of the National Federation of Settlements sent out last year a questionnaire designed to secure the opinions of settlement workers concerning the consequence of prohibition in terms of living conditions, community life, etc., in settlement neighborhoods. The results of the inquiry were reported at the annual meeting of the federation in Toronto during the summer of 1924. The inquiry was sent to 150 settlements and elicited, in all, 42 replies, many of which, however, left certain of the questions unanswered. The replies were hardly numerous or definite enough to have statistical value, but the report thus summarized the findings on the basis of a careful study of the returns: "There is less drinking; family life has improved—in some places in a quite remarkable degree; children are better fed and clothed and family ties have been strengthened; neighborhood disorder has been much reduced. . . .

"That there is more drinking in families and among the young in certain localities; that the law is violated; that the bootlegger is getting rich; that many old soaks have been sent

to an early if not an untimely grave, that individual liberty has been restrained and hypocrisy increased must be admitted. But we must remember that every great reform has been won only after many years of effort and with some temporary if not permanent losses. What everyone must admit is the patent fact that the struggle hold which the saloon had on our politics and much of our industrial life has been broken."

Young People Drinking.

One of the most disputed questions in connection with prohibition is the effect of the law upon moral conditions in colleges, high schools and elsewhere. The findings of the present study in this respect may be briefly stated.

There is a marked tendency on the part of young people to depart from conventional rules of behavior. This tendency is in no apparent way related to prohibition save as liquor drinking has become one of the many commonly tabooed performances that are turned to for the "kick" that large numbers of young people are trying to get out of life. If any single material factor is more important than another it is probably the automobile, certainly not the hip flask. Reports of school administration officials and of teachers who have made extensive studies of moral problems in the schools

give little support to the theory that prohibition is in itself a cause of moral breakdown. It may perhaps just as truly be said that it does not appear to be a great asset. Certainly, the non-observance of the law by parents has a rather tragic effect on boys and girls.

In the colleges, undoubtedly, some alarming conditions have developed. Even in a conservative denominational college a student has been known to earn his way through school by bootlegging. The evidence, however, seems to indicate a favorable trend at the present time; at least this is the opinion of nearly all the college deans consulted, and it receives some measure of support from other sources.

The most serious aspect of the situation in the colleges is the fact that the students' attitude toward drinking laws appears to be determined almost wholly without reference to the law. It is a matter of personal preference or perhaps of school discipline—the responsibilities of citizenship play but a little part. It should be said, however, that if the alumni can be persuaded to forego their bibulous habits on the occasions of class reunions and festivals, the problem will be much simplified.

But however much we may legitimately discount stories of excessive drinking among young people, the fact that prohibition has had no more decisive effect in heightening their moral tone gives food for earnest thought.

Prohibition and Drugs.

It has been intimated many times that however successful prohibition may be in reducing the consumption of alcoholic liquors, it has tended to increase the use of drugs. It appears, however, that statements to this effect have been chiefly on the plausible guess that a person forcibly deprived of alcohol would turn to drugs. The assumption quite overlooks the fact that it is probably everywhere at least as difficult for the addict to procure drugs as for the habitué drinker

to procure liquor, and in most places more difficult; hence, there is little point in the contention that alcoholics have been driven to drugs. Another important element in the situation is the fact that the physiology of alcoholism and that of drug addiction are quite different.

But we are not dependent entirely upon guesses in this matter. An inquiry has recently been made into the subject of the Foreign Policy association through its committee on traffic in opium, the results of which make it quite apparent that the reported increase of the drug traffic due to prohibition is a myth. Summarizing the findings, the secretary of the association in a letter directed to General Lincoln C. Andrews says: "It is the experience of every authority, without exception, that prohibition has had no effect whatsoever on the prevalence of drug addiction in the United States."

The narcotic division in the bureau of internal revenue, whose agents constitute one of the most efficient and best organized forces in government service, reports that drug addiction in the United States is decreasing, a conclusion which is supported by medical authorities in the public health service. It must be admitted, of course, that our information about drug addiction is limited.

"Respect for Law."

The general impression that respect for law is declining, leads many ardent supporters of prohibition to believe that its foes are undermining all citizenship, while the latter assert very positively that prohibition has destroyed respect for all law. Fortunately, neither contention is fully supported by facts. The best authorities in psychology and education agree that a person's attitude toward law and government is not determined with reference to a single statute, and that hostility toward one law does not carry over into the whole field of the citizen's responsibility. The attitude of people toward their government, although it often gives cause for concern, rests upon a broader basis than the popularity of a single law. Everyone takes some laws more seriously than others, and necessarily so. All laws have not the same importance and some have greater social sanction than others. For this reason it would be a mistake to rest the appeal for observance of prohibition laws merely upon the general duty to "obey the law." Rather, an attitude of intelligent sympathy toward the law itself must be built up if it is to be generally observed.

HOW PROHIBITION STANDS IN THE WORLD TODAY

Completely "Dry" Territory
Has Decreased Since the War, but Regulation of Liquor Traffic Is Stricter in Many Countries—Russia Joins "Wet" Nations

By JAMES C. YOUNG.

IS PROHIBITION gaining or losing? A look at the map of the world might lead one to believe it was appreciably on the wane, for the legally dry territory has decreased about one-third since 1922—Turkey having abandoned its anti-liquor laws last year, while Russia only recently put an end to an eleven-year trial of prohibition.

But if, turning from the map to legislation, one takes as criterion the regulation of the sale of spirits, it appears that temperance is making considerable inroads upon the liquor traffic. The demand for restrictions seems to have become more insistent and to have spread over a broader area than ever before.

The year 1922 may be considered to mark the furthest advance of the movement for total suppression of the sale of alcoholic beverages which began more than a century ago and made its greatest gains during the war. Though several States and nations have changed in the last year or two from an almost absolute dryness to a policy of permitting liquor manufacture and sale under regulations of varying stringency, others have increased their limitations upon the traffic.

The world aspect of prohibition is somewhat anomalous. Every nation with sumptuary laws appears to be having trouble in operating them, and most of the nations without such laws are considering writing them on their statute books. The United States, alone of all nations, has neither reduced nor increased the stringency of prohibition legislation enacted in the war period.

War Hastened Prohibition.

The war prompted virtually every civilized nation to reduce the consumption of alcohol. Nowhere, with the possible exception of Canada, did this question present such large moral issues as in the United States. But

England and her colonies, the Orient and Continental Europe limited the drinking of their subjects in the interest of grain conservation and wartime morals. The United States was the only nation enacting laws intended to have permanent effect.

Scarcely was the war ended when some of these nations began to liberalize their wartime measures. But the restrictions had given force to the temperance and prohibition movements in many countries. Germany, for instance, mustered a strong body of prohibitionists who contended for the outlawing of alcohol in all forms. A much larger body of Germans inclined to temperance regulations as a result of their experiences during the period of conflict.

Today the two opposing influences are actively at work in European countries and even within the same political parties. Norway still maintains a form of prohibition less stringent than ours; but Cabinets have fallen over the question. When the Government presented a bill to nullify the law it met defeat by a slight margin.

Finland's Experience.

There are only two countries where the manufacture or sale of beverages of low alcoholic content is forbidden—the United States and Finland. Finland has the distinction of being the first to adopt this form of prohibition. One of the earliest acts of the new nation after its severance from Russia was to establish a maximum of 2 per cent. of alcohol for beverages. That legislation became effective on June 1, 1919. In the next two years sponsors of prohibition throughout the world pointed to Finland as a model State. Convictions for inebriety dropped to 21,000 in 1920.

Then came the bootlegger, the man with a private still, and all the familiar train that has followed prohibition in the United States. By 1923 Finnish convictions for excessive drinking had passed 50,000 a year, said to be a new high mark. If the

contemporary evidence of travelers and press dispatches may be accepted, there still is considerable drinking in Finland, though a law passed in 1922 established even severer penalties than the act of 1919.

Developments in the United States under prohibitory laws are familiar to all observers. Thus the greatest and one of the smallest nations offer the outstanding examples of social conditions following the enactment of a law long sought. Only three other countries resorted to a full measure of prohibition during the war period or after, and each of these countries has returned to a form of regulation which differs little from the condition of 1914. Russia has just rescinded her prohibitory statutes. Turkey already had led the way in 1924, and Iceland authorized the use of wine in 1922.

The Turkish experiment lasted only a year. The Turk is a mild drinker at the worst, because of the Koran's prohibition of alcoholic liquors. But he has numerous subject peoples with a relish for wine, and the traffic paid considerable tribute to the Turkish treasury. Prohibition was found to be unprofitable and the new republic needed all the funds obtainable. So it was deemed well to let foreigners and others outside the pale of Mohammedanism drink as they chose and pay the State for that privilege.

Russia Back to Vodka.

In Russia other motives were behind the change in addition to the desire for larger revenue. The bootlegger was everywhere and home-made vodka flowed freely. Blindness and death by poisoning became frequent. It was believed that pure spirits sold legally would insure better social conditions than the secret traffic. After eleven years the Russian once more may have his vodka under virtually no restraint.

Passing from the countries that have experimented with absolute prohibition to those where stringent regulation has been tested, Canada immediately comes to mind. In some provinces this regulation almost to

the American brand of prohibition, but in all of them a wet tendency is noted. It would not be far short of the truth to say that Canada, as a whole, has reversed its earlier action.

A Study of Canada.

The prohibition record in Canada bears the closest resemblance to our own national experience. It has been a great civic and social experiment, in which the moral issues and religious support were strongly blended. But the evidence supplied by popular vote in most of the provinces indicates that prohibition failed to accomplish its ends; at least, it has failed in the estimate of Canadian voters.

Nova Scotia was the first province to go dry. It took this action as long ago as 1910, and prohibition still endures in that small territory, as well as in its neighbor, New Brunswick, which has been dry since 1917. Prince Edward Island also continues dry. These three divisions of the British Dominion in America stand apart from the great provinces as to prohibition.

Alberta was the first to embark upon prohibition in the war year of 1915, when the pressure of conflict began to be felt in the whole of Canada. In 1916 the adjoining province of British Columbia adopted similar legislation. Then Saskatchewan, on the eastern side of Alberta, acted upon the example of her neighbor provinces, closely followed by Manitoba, Ontario and Newfoundland. The Yukon Territory established dispensaries in 1918.

Ontario had been a dry stronghold for years. When the war prohibition measure went before the people in 1919 for their judgment by ballot, the dry majority polled 407,289 votes in a total of 1,147,785. The first break developed in 1920, when British Columbia departed from the dry forces by a popular majority of 26,000 against the 4,000 majority that had made it dry. Manitoba, the next province to vote upon the issue, yielded a majority of 40,000 for the wet

side. Alberta and Saskatchewan returned similar majorities. Newfoundland after seven years of prohibition and three plebiscites, had restored alcohol under regulation. This regulation may be described as liberal, specifying one bottle of alcoholic beverage per day per man as the maximum.

Quebec relaxed her wartime regulations considerably. The Yukon continued its dispensaries. Then came a change in Ontario that brought the legalization of 4.4 per cent. beer. In view of this shift in sentiment it has been predicted that the province would hold another vote upon prohibition, which would be the seventh in twenty-five years.

Movement in Southern Lands.

Aside from the United States, there is but one other really dry district in the new hemisphere, the Mexican province of Nuevo Leon. But the prohibition movement has gained considerable headway throughout Mexico

in recent years and it is believed that some form of regulatory legislation will be forthcoming in the near future.

The same general statement may be applied to Central and South America. Prohibition in any of the Latin-American countries seems improbable, but increasing regulation seems probable. The question has agitated Chile in particular. Already our campaigning methods have spread to these neighbor lands, where American prohibition leaders are at work.

In the British dominions of the Pacific also prohibition agitates the public mind. New Zealand voted last Wednesday to remain wet, though the prohibitionists, as usual, polled a heavy vote. Under the law such a vote must take place every three years, the referendum in 1922 having given prohibition a majority of 18,122 out of 600,000 votes or more. The struggle between opposing sides in New Zealand has brought into action the churches and the political organizations.

